
James W. Geary's well-researched, well-written, and well-illustrated inquiry into the operations of the Federal draft system during the Civil War is worthy of high praise. His account covers the entire Union from 1861 to 1865 but has special appeal for those interested in the situation in Indiana. Although Hoosiers made massive contributions to the Union war effort, their collective and individual adherence to the cause was neither as unqualified nor as enthusiastic as some historians have suggested. The state's ferociously partisan Governor Oliver P. Morton was accused of selling Indiana's naval recruitment credits to maritime Massachusetts. Women in the state were vocal in their opposition to the draft after the bloodbath at Fredericksburg. In October, 1863, part of the Indiana quota was met by the enlistment *en masse* of 150 Confederate deserters and prisoners of war. Home guard personnel were reluctant to serve in Federal army units in 1864 because they feared an outbreak of guerrilla activity in their home districts. On several occasions Union recruiting agents were attacked, and at least one, in Brown County, was murdered. Prior to the general election of 1864 Schuyler Colfax of Indiana, speaker of the United States House of Representatives, counseled President Abraham Lincoln to furlough Indiana regiments so that they might vote at home and advised the president to keep "pending" the draft in the state before polling day. During a special draft designed to free seasoned troops from garrison duty, the Hoosier state distinguished itself by having the greatest deficiency among participating states—a whopping 64 percent.

To be sure, the author is correct in emphasizing the difficulties the Federal conscription program experienced in Indiana. His final judgment, however, is that the draft was not quite as successful anywhere as earlier historians have suggested. Once the volunteer enthusiasm of the first months of conflict had evaporated, Lincoln and his civilian and military coadjutors were hard put to it to keep the ranks of the Union army filled by the unprecedented conscription method or the threat of it. And despite the problems faced by the Lincoln administration in raising men in Indiana and elsewhere, one cannot deny that approximately 200,000 Hoosiers—out of a military manpower pool of perhaps 300,000 and a total population of roughly 1.35 million—served (some in multiple enlistments) in the Union army and home guard.

An extensive bibliography of archival and printed sources bears witness to the thoroughness of the author's research. Two
sections of illustrations offer contemporary views of recruiting stations and officials, their clientele, bounty jumpers, and other players in the deadly game.

Richard H. Thompson teaches history at the Columbus, Indiana, campus of Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis.


Seven essays on social developments in the North during and after the Civil War comprise the contents of this slender volume. Maris A. Vinovskis's central purpose is to provide examples of work “that can and should be done” (p. vii). Of the seven pieces, only his “Have Social Historians Lost the Civil War? Some Preliminary Demographic Speculations” has appeared previously. The substance of the remaining essays are derived from master theses and dissertations by “scholars in their twenties and thirties” (p. vii). He finds that this age factor is important because it “suggests that the next generation of scholars will pay more attention to the social history of the Civil War than have their predecessors” (p. vii).

Vinovskis's call for more emphasis on social history is hardly new. Almost two decades ago, Eric Foner in an essay in *Civil War History* admonished both political and social historians of the era to give more attention to each other's area of interest. Among those who have done so are Iver Bernstein, Joseph T. Glatthaar, Randall C. Jimerson, Philip Shaw Paludan, Judith Lee Hallock, and Emily J. Harris.

Vinovskis's splendid and provocative article on demography definitely warrants reading. Among the remaining essays that contain major findings are Amy Holmes's study of Union widows and Stuart McConnell's analysis of Union veterans who joined the Grand Army of the Republic in the postwar era. Some of the other case studies are not as important or relevant. For example, Reid Mitchell's discussion of the influence that home had on the discipline and bravery of Union soldiers and the difficulties that officers experienced in maintaining distance between themselves and enlisted men who were their neighbors at home are subjects that have been treated earlier by Gerald F. Linderman. One wonders why the editor chose to include Robin Einhorn's, “The Civil War and Municipal Government in Chicago” in a work on social history when Harris's excellent article on Deerfield, Massachusetts, would have been more in keeping with the volume's spirit and intent. Finally, none of the essays treats significantly the